

### **Remarks**

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed April 24, 2009.

#### **I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections**

In the Office Action mailed April 24, 2009, Claims 1, 18-28, 34-35, 37-39, 43-44 and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanath et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,206,827, hereinafter Viswanath) in view of Travis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,280,610, hereinafter Travis). Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanath in view of Travis and further in view of Sparks (U.S. Patent No. 5,212,784). Claims 30-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanath, in view of Travis, and in view of official notice. Claims 40-42 and 45-47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanath in view of Travis and further in view of Johnson (U.S. Patent No. 6,788,980).

#### **II. Summary of Applicant's Amendments**

The present Response hereby amends Claim 1; cancels Claims 25, 38, and 40-41; and adds new Claim 49, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1, 18-24, 26-35, 37, 39 and 42-49. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to prosecute any originally presented, canceled or amended claims in any continuing or future application.

#### **III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). The claims are addressed in the following paragraphs:

##### **Claim 1**

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 currently defines:

1. *A computer-readable storage medium containing instructions stored thereon, which when read and executed by a plurality of computers cause the plurality of computers to perform steps comprising:  
receiving, at an administrative server, an MBean definition file in a markup language format;  
generating, at the administrative server, an MBean archive file from the MBean definition file, wherein the MBean archive file includes a tag for an MBean*

*and a tag for each attribute, operation, and potential notification issued by the MBean;*  
*sending the archive file from the administrative server to a managed server in a management domain, wherein the management domain is a collection of distributed servers that are managed as a unit;*  
*using the archive file to instantiate the MBean upon the managed server;*  
*determining a scope of the MBean, said scope specified in the MBean definition file or on a specific instance upon creation, wherein the scope of the MBean is set to be either server-specific for the managed server or shared in the management domain, wherein the managed server contains copies of the MBeans scoped server-specific to the managed server, and wherein the administration server contains copies of MBeans shared in the management domain; and*  
*providing a custom management capability through the MBean over the management domain, wherein if the MBean is scoped to be server-specific to the managed server, applications and servers must access the specific managed server to read the MBean in order to invoke the custom management capability.*

Claim 1 has been amended to specifically define the step of determining a scope of the MBean. The scope of the MBean is specified in the MDF file or on a specific instance upon creation. The scope is set to be either server-specific to the managed server, or shared across the management domain. The managed server contains the copies of the MBeans which are scoped server-specific to the managed server. The administration server contains copies of the MBeans which are scoped to be shared across the management domain.

When the MBean is instantiated, it provides a custom management capability. If the instantiated MBean is scoped to be server-specific to the managed server, all the servers and applications that wish to invoke the custom management capability must access the managed server to read the MBean. This is because the administration server, which contains MBeans of shared scope, does not contain any server-specific scoped MBeans.

The Viswanath reference teaches a dynamic administration framework for server systems. More specifically, Viswanath appears to describe a mechanism used to generate components of an administration framework from meta-information that describes persistently stored configuration information. A configuration API may also be provided, that provides a transparent interface to the persistent store, abstracting storage format and location from the clients of the configuration API.

The Travis reference teaches methods and apparatus for implementing databases to provide object oriented invocation of applications. More specifically, Travis was cited in the Office Action as disclosing "Control server registry 1428 has a local scope so that only the server platform 1300 is aware of resident method executables." (Office Action, page 6, Travis, col. 30, lines 33-35).

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Viswanath in combination with Travis (hereinafter the cited references) fail to disclose the features of Claim 1, as amended.

Specifically, the cited references fail to disclose determining a scope of the MBean, said scope specified in the MBean definition file or on a specific instance upon creation, wherein the scope of the MBean is set to be either server-specific for the managed server or shared in the management domain, as defined in amended Claim 1. Neither reference discloses MBeans that are scoped in this manner, nor determining the scope of the MBean.

For example, in the Office Action, it was agreed that Viswanath fails to disclose any MBean that is scoped to be server-specific (Office Action, page 3). It was proposed, however, that Travis teaches some form of object for which the scope has been asset to server specific. More particularly, the portion of Travis was cited disclosing a "control server registry 1428 has a local scope so that only the server platform 1300 is aware of resident method executables." (Travis, col. 30, lines 33-35). However, Applicant respectfully submits that this is different from Claim 1, as currently amended. Firstly, a control server registry is not the same as an MBean. Secondly, there is no disclosure in Travis of determining the scope of the MBean specified in the MDF file or on a specific instance. Thirdly, there is no disclosure of MBeans which are either scoped to be server-specific or scoped to be shared across the management domain, as defined in amended Claim 1.

Furthermore, the cited references fail to disclose that the managed server contains copies of the MBeans scoped server-specific to the managed server, and the administration server contains copies of MBeans shared in the management domain, as defined in amended Claim 1.

In Viswanath, the administration server appears to contain all of the generated MBeans. In the Office Action, it was proposed that Viswanath also discloses an embodiment in which "user applications may not be deployed to an administration server." (Office Action, page 2, Viswanath, col. 15, lines 17-18). However, Applicant respectfully submits that this is different from Claim 1, as amended. Claim 1 specifically defines that the managed server contains the server-specific scoped MBeans and the admin server contains all shared scoped MBeans. While Viswanath may disclose that some *user applications* may not be deployed on the admin server, there is no disclosure of any *MBeans* being deployed on the managed server. More importantly, there is no mention whatsoever that the managed server contains MBeans of one scope, while the admin scope contains MBeans of another scope, as defined in amended Claim 1. This separation of MBeans based on their scope is not described in either reference.

In addition, to further distinguish from the cited references, Claim 1 has been amended to

recite providing a custom management capability, wherein if the MBean is scoped to be server-specific to the managed server, applications and servers must access the specific managed server to read the MBean in order to invoke the custom management capability, as defined in amended Claim 1. This functionality is also not disclosed in either reference.

**Claims 1, 18-24, 26-35, 37, 39 and 42-48**

Claims 1, 18-24, 26-35, 37, 39 and 42-48 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 18-24, 26-35, 37, 39 and 42-48 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

**Claims 25, 38 and 40-41**

The present Response hereby cancels Claims 25, 38 and 40-41, thereby rendering moot any rejection as to these claims. Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

**IV. Additional Amendment**

The present Response hereby adds new method Claim 49. Applicant respectfully submits that new Claim 49 is fully supported by the disclosure as originally filed and requests consideration thereof.

**V. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 19, 2009

By: /Justas Geringson/  
Justas Geringson  
Reg. No. 57,033

Customer No. 80548  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800